

CF 1002

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BILASPUR**  
**CHHATTISGARH**

**WRIT APPEAL NO. 22 /2007**

**[ARISING OUT OF WRIT PETITION NO. 4065/04]**

**APPELLANT:**

**PETITIONER**

Dal Singar, S/o Shri Inder Singar

Aged about 36 years, [Ex-Watman  
of Block Wadrafnagar]

R/o Wadrafnagar Distt. Surguja

Chhattisgarh.

**VERSUS**

**RESPONDENTS:**

1. State of Chhattisgarh,  
Through Secretary, General  
Administration Department  
D.K.S. Bhawan Raipur [C.G.]
2. Collector, Surguja  
Ambikapur, Distt. Surguja [C.G.]
3. Block Development officer  
Block Wadrafnagar Distt. Surguja  
Chhattisgarh



**RECEIVED-COPY**  
18/11/07  
CLERK to A.G. BILASPUR

**WRIT APPEAL UNDER**

*Chhappa*  
Rule 157(16) The High Court  
of Chhattisgarh Rules 2005)

**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH : BILASPUR**

**Division Bench**

36

Coram : Hon'ble Shri H.L. Dattu, CJ &  
Hon'ble Shri V.K. Shrivastava, J

**WRIT APPEAL NO. 22 OF 2007**

**APPELLANT**

Dal Singar

**Versus**

**RESPONDENTS**

The State of Chhattisgarh and  
others.

**Present :**

Shri J.K. Shastri, counsel for the appellant.

Shri N.K. Agrawal, Dy. Advocate General for the State/  
respondents.

**ORAL ORDER**

(Passed on 23<sup>rd</sup> February, 2007)

The following oral order of the Court was passed by  
H.L. Dattu, C.J.

Sometime in the year 1987 appellant was appointed as a  
part-time Sweeper in the respondent establishment. In the year  
1989 he was appointed again on a temporary basis as a watchman.  
It is stated in the memo of appeal that in the year 1994 he was paid  
regular pay scale. Respondents had terminated the services of the  
petitioner by order dated 31/05/2000.

2) Aggrieved by the said order, petitioner was before this Court  
in Writ Petition No.4065/2004. The learned single Judge of this  
Court had rejected the writ petition applying the principles laid down  
by the Apex Court in the case of *Uma Devi*.

We have carefully perused the judgment rendered by learned single Judge of this Court. In our view the judgment is in consonance with the law declared by the Apex Court in the case of Uma Devi. Therefore, interference with law laid down by learned single Judge of this Court is not called for. Accordingly, this appeal requires to be rejected and accordingly it is rejected.

Ordered accordingly.

Sd/-  
Chief Justice

Sd/-  
V.K.Shrivastava  
Judge